

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicant and Applicant's attorney would like to thank Examiner Flood for her responsiveness and willingness to answer questions regarding this application. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application in view of the foregoing amendments to the claims and the following comments.

In the Office Action mailed July 15, 2005, claims 43, 44, 48 and 49 were examined and rejected as follows:

- Claims 43, 44, 48 and 49 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as allegedly non-enabled in light of the specification.
- Claims 43, 44, 48 and 49 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly indefinite for failing to point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention.

By this Amendment, Applicant has canceled claims 43-49, without prejudice. Accordingly, the Examiner's rejections of claims 43, 44, 48 and 49 are now moot and should be withdrawn. In an effort to more clearly define the present invention and not for reasons related to patentability, Applicant has added new claims 50-67.

Conclusion

This application should now be in condition for a favorable action. Allowance of the application is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conversation with Applicant's undersigned attorney might expedite the prosecution of this application, she is requested to call the undersigned attorney at the telephone number indicated below. Any fees due in connection with the filing of this Amendment should be charged to Deposit Account No. 19-1853.

Respectfully submitted,
SHEPPARD, MULLIN, RICHTER & HAMPTON LLP

By: _____

Steve P. Hassid
Registration No. 46,762

333 South Hope Street, 48th Floor
Los Angeles, California 90071
(213) 620-1780 x4156